



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

CN

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,997	11/30/2001	Karin Julliard	9505-284	1013
21971	7590	02/06/2004	EXAMINER	
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI 650 PAGE MILL ROAD PALO ALTO, CA 943041050			NGUYEN, DUNG T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2828	

DATE MAILED: 02/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/006,997	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JULLIARD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dung (Michael) T Nguyen	<b>Art Unit</b> 2828	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dung (Michael) T Nguyen.

(3) Hao Tung.

(2) Paul Ip.

(4) Hanna Hoffmann.

Date of Interview: 02 February 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant clarified that the the portion of the gas permeable surface of the container is opaque to optical UV radiation. However, the argument is not persuasive because the claims do not support the term "opaque" in order to define the difference of the container to define subject matter patentable. Further, the claims do not provide a UV laser apparatus. Therefore, the invention in the application is not patentable over the reference.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required